

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED

FEB 1 1968

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

APPENDIX

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967

No. 695

CHARLES C. GREEN, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

—v.—

COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF NEW KENT COUNTY,
VIRGINIA, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR CERTIORARI FILED OCTOBER 9, 1967

CERTIORARI GRANTED DECEMBER 11, 1967

INDEX

	PAGE
District Court Docket Sheet	1a
Complaint	3a
Motion to Dismiss	13a
Order on Motion to Dismiss	14a
Plaintiffs' Interrogatories	15a
Answer	21a
Defendants' Answers to Plaintiffs' Interrogatories	23a
Plan for School Desegregation	34a
First Memorandum of the District Court	47a
First Order of the District Court	49a
Defendants' Plan Supplement	50a
Plaintiffs' Exception to Plan Supplement	52a
Final Memorandum of the District Court	53a
Final Order of the District Court	62a

ii

PAGE

Decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit	63a
Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit	65a
Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit	90a
Order Extending Time to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari	91a
Order Allowing Certiorari	92a

District Court Docket Sheet

4266—New Kent

DATE	PROCEEDINGS
1965	
March 15	Complaint filed, summons issued. ***
Apr.	5 Motion to dismiss filed by County School Board of New Kent Co., W. R. Davis, E. P. Binns, Jr., W. J. Wallace, Jr. and Harry S. Mountcastle, ind. & as members of the County School Board and Byrd W. Long, Div. Supt. of Schools of New Kent Co., Va.
May	3 Motion for consolidation of motion to dismiss with hearing on merits, for requirement of answer by defts and for fixing of trial date filed by plts. " 5 Order deferring ruling on motion to dismiss; directing defts. to answer on or before 6-1-65; directing Clerk to call case at next docket call, ent. 5-5-65. *** " 7 Interrogatories filed by plfs. " 24 Order extending time to 6-8-65 for deft. School Board to file answers to interrogatories ent. 5-24-65. ***
June	1 Answer filed by defts. " 8 Answer to interrogatories filed by County School Board of New Kent Co., Va. Exhibits attached ***
1966	
May	4 TRIAL PROCEEDINGS—Butzner, J.: Parties appeared by counsel. Issues joined. Discussion. Court to enter order.

DATE

PROCEEDINGS

- May 4 *** Motion of defendants for 30 days within which to file Plan, granted.
- " 10 Plan of desegregation filed by School Board.
- " 17 Memorandum of the court filed
- " " Order that defts/ motion to dismiss denied; Pltfs. prayer for an injunction restraining school construction & purchase of school sites denied; Defts. granted leave to submit on or before June 6, 1966 amendments to their plan which will provide for employment & assignment on non-racial basis. Pending receipt of these amendments to their plan which will defer approval of plan & consideration of other ~~injunctive~~ relief; Pltfs. motion for counsel fees denied; Case will be retained upon docket with leave granted to any party to petition for further relief; Pltfs. shall recover their costs to date.; ent. & filed; ***
- June 6 Motion for leave to file & request for approval of a plan supplement filed by defts. together with plan supplement.
- " 10 Exceptions to plan supplement filed by pltf.
- June 10 In OPEN COURT—Butzner, J.: Counsel discussed exceptions to Plan. Court will approve Plan.
- " 16 Notice of Appeal from order of 5-17-66 filed by plfs.
- ***
- " 28 Memorandum of the Court filed.
- " " Order approving Plan adopted by the New Kent County School Board, ent. 6-28-66. Case to be retained on docket. ***

Complaint

(Filed March 15, 1965)

I

1. (a) Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Title 28, United States Code, Section 1331. This action arises under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Section 1, and under Title 42, United States Code, Section 1981, as hereafter more fully appears. The matter in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00).

(b) Jurisdiction is further invoked under Title 28, United States Code, Section 1343(3). This action is authorized by Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983 to be commenced by any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to redress the deprivation under color of state law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of rights, privileges and immunities secured by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and by Title 42, United States Code, Section 1981, providing for the equal rights of citizens and of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, as hereafter more fully appears.

II

2. Infant plaintiffs are Negroes, are citizens of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and are residents of and domiciled in the political subdivision of Virginia for which the defendant school board maintains and operates public schools. Said infants are within the

age limits or will be within the age limits to attend, and possess or upon reaching such age limit will possess all qualifications and satisfy all requirements for admission to, said public schools.

3. Adult plaintiffs are Negroes, are citizens of the United States and are residents and taxpayers of and domiciled in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the above mentioned political subdivision thereof. Each adult plaintiff who is named in the caption as next friend of one or more of the infant plaintiffs is a parent, guardian or person standing in *loco parentis* of the infant or infants indicated.

4. The infant plaintiffs and their parents, guardians and persons standing in *loco parentis* bring this action in their own behalf and, there being common questions of law and fact affecting the rights of all other Negro children attending public schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia and, particularly, in the said political subdivision, similarly situated and affected with reference to the matters here involved, who are so numerous as to make it impracticable to bring all before the Court, and a common relief being sought as will hereinafter more fully appear, the infant plaintiffs and their parents, guardians and persons standing in *loco parentis* also bring this action, pursuant to Rule 23(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as a class action on behalf of all other Negro children attending or who hereafter will attend public schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia and, particularly, in said political subdivision and the parents and guardians of such children similarly situated and affected with reference to the matters here involved.

5. Further, the adult plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to Rule 23(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as a class action on behalf of those of the citizens and taxpayers of said political subdivision who are Negroes; the tax raised contribution of persons of that class toward the establishment, operation and maintenance of the schools controlled by the defendant school board being in excess of \$10,000.00. The interests of said class are adequately represented by the plaintiffs.

III

6. The Commonwealth of Virginia has declared public education a state function. The Constitution of Virginia, Article IX, Section 129, provides:

"Free schools to be maintained. The General Assembly shall establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State."

Pursuant to this mandate, the General Assembly of Virginia has established a system of public free schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia according to a plan set out in Title 22, Chapters 1 to 15, inclusive, of the Code of Virginia, 1950. The establishment, maintenance and administration of the public school system of Virginia is vested in a State Board of Education, a Superintendent of Public Instruction, Division Superintendents of Schools, and County, City and Town School Boards (Constitution of Virginia, Article IX, Sections 130-133; Code of Virginia, 1950, Title 22, Chapter 1, Section 22-2).

IV

7. The defendant School Board exists pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia as

an administrative department of the Commonwealth, discharging governmental functions, and is declared by law to be a body corporate. Said School Board is empowered and required to establish, maintain, control and supervise an efficient system of public free schools in said political subdivision, to provide suitable and proper school buildings, furniture and equipment, and to maintain, manage and control the same, to determine the studies to be pursued and the methods of teaching, to make local regulations for the conduct of the schools and for the proper discipline of students, to employ teachers, to provide for the transportation of pupils, to enforce the school laws, and to perform numerous other duties, activities and functions essential to the establishment, maintenance and operation of the public free schools in said political subdivision. (Constitution of Virginia, Article IX, Section 133; Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, Title 22.) The names of the individual members of the defendant School Board are as stated in the caption and they are made defendants herein in their individual capacities.

8. The defendant Division Superintendent of Schools, whose name as such is stated in the caption, holds office pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia as an administrative officer of the public free school system of Virginia. (Constitution of Virginia, Article IX, Section 133; Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, Title 22.) He is under the authority, supervision and control of, and acts pursuant to the orders, policies, practices, customs and usages of the defendant School Board. He is made a defendant herein as an individual and in his official capacity.

9. A Virginia statute, known as the Pupil Placement Act, first enacted as Chapter 70 of the Acts of the 1956 Extra Session of the General Assembly, viz. Article 1.1 of Chapter 12 of Title 22 (Sections 22-232.1 through 22-232.17) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, confers or purports to confer upon the Pupil Placement Board all power of enrollment or placement of pupils in the public schools in Virginia and to charge said Pupil Placement Board to perform numerous duties, activities and functions pertaining to the enrollment or placement of pupils in, and the determination of school attendance districts for, such public schools, except in those counties, cities or towns which elect to be bound by the provisions of Article 1.2 of Chapter 12 of Title 22 (Sections 22-232.18 through 22-232.31) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that in executing its power or purported power of enrollment or placement of pupils in and determination of school districts for the public schools of said political subdivision, the Pupil Placement Board will follow and approve the recommendations of the defendant School Board unless it appears that such recommendation would deny the application of a Negro parent for the assignment of his child to a school attended by similarly situated white children.

11. The procedures provided by the Pupil Placement Act do not provide an adequate means by which the plaintiffs may obtain the relief here sought.

V

12. Notwithstanding the holding and admonitions in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U. S. 483 (1954) and

349 U. S. 294 (1955), the defendant School Board maintains and operates a biracial school system in which certain schools are designated for Negro students only and are staffed by Negro personnel and none other, and certain schools are designated for white students or primarily for white students and are staffed by white personnel and none other. This pattern continues unaffected except in the few instances, if any there are, in which individual Negroes have sought and obtained admission to one or more of the schools designated for white students. The defendants have not devoted efforts toward initiating nonsegregation in the public school system, neither have they made a reasonable start to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system, as under paramount law it is their duty to do. Deliberately and purposefully, and solely because of race, the defendants continue to require or permit all or virtually all Negro public school children to attend schools where none but Negroes are enrolled and none but Negroes are employed as principal or teacher or administrative assistant and to require all white public school children to attend school where no Negroes, or at best few Negroes, are enrolled and where no Negroes teach or serve as principal or administrative assistant.

13. Heretofore, petitions signed by several persons similarly situated and conditioned as are the plaintiffs with respect to race, citizenship, residence and status as taxpayers, were filed with the defendant School Board, asking the School Board to end racial segregation in the public school system and urging the Board to make announcement of its purpose to do so at its next regular meeting and promptly thereafter to adopt and publish a plan by which racial discrimination will be terminated with respect to

administrative personnel, teachers, clerical, custodial and other employees, transportation and other facilities, and the assignment of pupils to schools and classrooms.

14. Representatives of the plaintiff class forwarded said petitions to the defendant School Board with a letter, copy of which was sent to each member of the defendant School Board, part of which is next set forth:

" * * * In the light of the following and other court decisions, your duty [to promptly end racial segregation in the public school system] is no longer open to question:

Brown v. Bd. of Education, 347 U. S. 483 (1954);

Brown v. Bd. of Education, 349 U. S. 294 (1955);

Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U. S. 1 (1958);

Bradley v. School Bd. of the City of Richmond,
317 F 2d 429 (4th Cir. 1963);

Bell v. Co. School Ed. of Powhatan Co., 321 F
2d 494 (4th Cir. 1963).

"We call to your attention the fact that in the last cited case the unyielding refusal of the County School Board of Powhatan County, Virginia, to take any initiative with regard to its duty to desegregate schools resulted in the board's being required to pay costs of litigation including compensation to the attorneys for the Negro school children and their parents. We are advised that upon a showing of a deliberate refusal of individual school board members to perform their clear duty to desegregate schools, the courts may require them as individuals to bear the expense of the litigation.

"In the case of *Watson v. City of Memphis*, 373 U. S. 526 (1963) the Supreme Court of the United States expressed its unanimous dissatisfaction with the slothfulness which has followed its 1955 mandate in *Brown v. Board of Education*, saying: 'The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now and, unless there is an overwhelmingly compelling reason, they are to be promptly fulfilled.' "

15. More than two regular meetings of the defendant School Board have been held since it received the petitions and letter above referred to. Neither by word or deed has the defendant School Board indicated its willingness to end racial segregation in its public school system.

VI

16. In the following and other particulars, plaintiffs suffer and will continue to suffer irreparable injury as a result of the persistent failure and refusal of the defendants to initiate desegregation and to adopt and implement a plan providing for the elimination of racial discrimination in the public school system.

17. Negro public school children are yet being educated in inherently unequal separate educational facilities specially sited, built, equipped and staffed as Negro schools, in violation of their liberty and of their right to equal protection of the laws.

18. Negro adult citizens are yet being taxed for the support and maintenance of a biracial school system the very existence of which connotes a degrading classification of the citizenship status of persons of the Negro race, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

19. Public funds are being spent and will be spent by the defendants for the erection of schools and additions to schools deliberately planned and sited so as to insure or facilitate the continued separation of Negro children in the public school system from others of similar age and qualification solely because of their race, contrary to the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment which forbid governmental agencies, whether acting ingeniously or ingenuously, to make any distinctions between citizens based on race.

20. This action has been necessitated by reason of the failure and refusal of the individual members of the defendant School Board to execute and perform their official duty, which since May 31, 1955 has been clear, to initiate desegregation and to make and execute plans to bring about the elimination of racial discrimination in the public school system.

VII

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully pray:

A. That the defendants be restrained and enjoined from failing and refusing to adopt and forthwith implement a plan which will provide for the prompt and efficient elimination of racial segregation in the public schools operated by the defendant School Board, including the elimination of any and all forms of racial discrimination with respect to administrative personnel, teachers, clerical, custodial and other employees, transportation and other facilities, and the assignment of pupils to schools and classrooms.

B. That pending the Court's approval of such plan the defendants be enjoined and restrained from initiating or

proceeding further with the construction of any school building or of any addition to an existing school building or the purchase of land for either purpose to any extent not previously approved by the Court.

C. That the defendants pay the costs of this action including fees for the plaintiffs' attorneys in such amounts as to the Court may appear reasonable and proper and that the plaintiffs have such other and further relief as may be just.

/s/ S. W. TUCKER
Of Counsel for Plaintiffs

Motion to Dismiss

(Filed April 5, 1965)

Now come the County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia, W. R. Davis, E. P. Binns, Jr., W. J. Wallace, Jr., and Harry S. Mountcastle, individually and as members of the County School Board, and comes Byrd W. Long, Division Superintendent of Schools of New Kent County, Virginia, and move the Court to dismiss the Complaint herein upon the following grounds:

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

(Signature of Counsel Omitted)

Order on Motion to Dismiss

The Court defers ruling on the motion to dismiss. The defendants are directed to answer on or before June 1, 1965.

The Clerk is directed to call this case at the next docket call.

Let the Clerk send copies of this order to counsel of record.

/s/ JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR.
United States District Judge

May 5, 1965

Plaintiffs' Interrogatories

(Filed May 7, 1965)

Plaintiffs request that the defendant School Board, by an officer or agent thereof, answer under oath in accordance with Rule 33, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the following interrogatories:

1. List for each public school operated by the defendant School Board the following:
 - a. Date on which each school was erected;
 - b. Grades served by each school during the 1964-65 school term;
 - c. Planned pupil capacity of each school;
 - d. Number of white pupils in attendance at school in each grade level as of most recent dates for which figures are available for 1964-65 term;
 - e. Number of Negro pupils in attendance at school in each grade level as of most recent date for which figures are available for 1964-65 term;
 - f. Number of Negro teachers and other administrative or professional personnel and the number of white teachers, etc., employed at each school during 1964-65 school term;
 - g. Pupil-teacher ratio at each school during 1964-65 school term (most recent available figures);
 - h. Average class size for each school during 1964-65 school term (most recent available figures);
 - i. Name and address of principal of each school.

2. Furnish a map or maps indicating the attendance areas served by each school in the system during the 1963-64 term and the 1964-65 term. If no such map or maps can be furnished, state where such maps or other descriptions of the attendance areas may be found and inspected.
3. State the number of Negro pupils and the number of white pupils, by grade level, residing in each attendance area established by the School Board during the 1964-65 school term. If definite figures are unavailable, give the best projections or estimates available, stating the basis for any such estimates or projections.
4. State whether any pupils are transported by school buses to schools within the school division, and if there are any, give the average daily attendance of transported students during 1964-65 term, stating separately the number of white pupils and the number of Negro pupils in the elementary grades and in the high schools and in the junior high schools.
5. Furnish a map or maps indicating the bus routes in effect throughout the school division during the 1963-64 term and for the 1964-65 term (indicate for each bus route the name and address of the bus driver and the race of the students transported).
6. State with respect to the 1964-65 term, the total number of white pupils who reside in the attendance area of an all-Negro school, but were in attendance at an all-white or predominantly white school. Indicate with respect to such pupils the following:
 - a. Number, by grade, residing in the attendance area of each Negro school;

- b. The schools actually attended by white pupils residing in the attendance area of each Negro school.
7. State the total number of Negro pupils who were initially assigned to attend all-white or predominantly white schools for the first time during either the 1963-64 school term or the 1964-65 term. Give a breakdown of these totals by schools and grades.
8. State whether during the 1964-65 term it was necessary at any schools to utilize for classroom purposes any areas not primarily intended for such use, such as library areas, teachers' lounges, cafeterias, gymnasiums, etc. If so, list the schools and facilities so utilized.
9. State whether a program or course in Distributive Education is offered in the school system and if so at what schools it is offered.
10. Are any special teachers for subjects such as art and music provided?
11. If so, state:
- a. The number of such special teachers in the system;
 - b. The number of full-time special teachers;
 - c. The number of part-time special teachers;
 - d. The schools to which they are assigned for the current school year;
 - e. The schools to which they were assigned for the preceding school year.

12. Indicate whether a program of vocational education was offered in any school or schools in the system during the 1963-64 or the 1964-65 school term.

13. If so, state for each such year the name of each vocational education course at each school and the number of pupils enrolled therein; and give the number of individuals teaching vocational education at each school.

14. Furnish a statement of the curriculum offered at each junior high school and each high school in the system during the 1964-65 term.

15. Furnish a list of the courses of instruction, if any, which are available to seventh grade students who attend junior high schools in the system but are not available to those seventh grade pupils assigned to elementary schools.

16. State whether any summer school programs operated by the School Board have been operated on a desegregated basis with Negro and white pupils attending the same classes.

17. Are any buildings of frame construction presently being utilized for schools? If so, which ones?

18. Are any of the school buildings in need of major repairs? If so, which ones?

19. State with respect to any new school construction which is now contemplated, the following with respect to each such project:

a. Location of contemplated school or addition;

b. Size of school, present and proposed number of classrooms, grades to be served, and projected capacity;

c. Estimated date of completion and occupancy;

d. Number of Negro pupils and number of white pupils attending grades to be served by such school who reside in existing or projected attendance area for such school.

20. State as to each teacher and principal first employed by the School Board during the school year 1964-65 and each of the four preceding school terms the following:

a. His or her name, age at time of such employment, sex, race;

b. Initial date of employment by the defendant School Board;

c. Teaching experience prior to employment by defendant School Board;

d. College from which graduated and degrees earned;

e. Major subjects studied in college and in graduate school;

f. Certificate from State Board of Education held at time of initial employment by defendant School Board, date thereof, and specific endorsements thereon;

g. The school and (elementary) grade or (high school) subjects which he was assigned to teach at time of initial employment;

h. Ratings earned for each year since initial employment by defendant School Board.

21. Are any records maintained which reflect the turnover of teachers in each school?

22. If so, state:

- a. Type of records maintained;
- b. For what periods such records are maintained;
- c. Where they are located;
- d. In whose custody they are maintained.

23. Are any records maintained which reflect the mobility of children in and out of the school system and in and out of specific schools, including transfers and dropouts?

24. If so, state:

- a. Type of records maintained;
- b. Where these records are located;
- c. In whose custody they are maintained.

25. State the amount of funds received through programs of Federal assistance to education during each of the school sessions 1963-64 and 1964-65.

26. State whether any pledge of non-discrimination has been signed by or on behalf of defendant School Board.

27. Give a copy of any plans for desegregation submitted to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or to any other agency of the State or Federal Government.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that a copy of such answers must be served upon the undersigned within fifteen days after service.

/s/ HENRY L. MARSH III
Of Counsel for Plaintiffs

Answer

(Filed June 1, 1965)

The undersigned defendants for Answer to the Complaint exhibited against them say as follows:

1. These defendants deny that the amount in controversy herein exceeds the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) as alleged in paragraph 1 (a) of the Complaint.
2. These defendants deny that this Court has jurisdiction under Title 28, United States Code, Section 1331 or Title 28, United States Code, Section 1343(3), or Title 42, United States Code, Section 1983 to grant any of the relief prayed for in the Complaint.
3. The allegations of paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Complaint are neither admitted or denied but the defendants believe the allegations to be essentially true.
4. These defendants specifically deny that there are questions of law and fact *affecting the rights of all other Negro children attending public schools in the said political subdivision* and call for strict proof thereof and of the fact that it is impracticable to bring all before the Court who desire the relief being sought. These defendants affirmatively allege that, as will hereinafter more fully appear, the Constitutional and statutory rights of all children in the said political subdivision, in so far as public schools are concerned, are protected by the defendants and the desire for the relief being sought is common only to the named plaintiffs.
5. These defendants deny that grounds for a class action exist as alleged in paragraph 5 of the Complaint and

deny that those constituting the group seeking relief herein contributed taxes in excess of \$10,000.00 and call for strict proof.

6. The allegations of paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the Complaint are admitted insofar as they assert the existence of various Constitutional and statutory provisions of the Commonwealth of Virginia. These defendants are not required and therefore do not admit or deny the accuracy of the plaintiffs interpretation of the provisions of law to which reference is made.

7. These defendants believe the allegations of paragraph 10 to be correct except that they believe that the Pupil Placement Board would refuse to follow any recommendations which denied an application due to the race of the applicant whether the applicant be Negro or white.

8. These defendants, in answer to paragraph 11 of the Complaint, assert that the assignment procedures available to the plaintiffs afford an adequate means for obtaining all rights to which they are entitled.

9. The allegations of paragraphs 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are denied except that the defendants admit having received the petition and letter referred to in paragraphs 13 and 14.

10. Infant plaintiffs and all others eligible to enroll in the pupil schools in the political subdivision are permitted, under existing policy, to attend the school of their choice without regard to race subject only to limitations of space.

WHEREFORE, defendants pray to be dismissed with their costs.

(Signature of Counsel Omitted)

Defendants' Answers to Plaintiffs' Interrogatories

(Filed June 8, 1965)

Now comes Byrd W. Long, Division Superintendent of schools of New Kent County, Virginia, and submits the following answers to interrogatories filed by the plaintiffs, said answers correspond to the numbered paragraphs in the interrogatories, to-wit:

1. a. Date on which each school was erected:

1. New Kent High School erected 1930 (Addition 1934). Elementary Building erected 1954 (Addition 1961).
2. George W. Watkins High School erected 1950. Elementary Building erected 1958 (Addition 1961).

b. Grades served by each school during the 1964-65 school term:

1. New Kent served grades one through twelve.
2. George W. Watkins served grades one through twelve.

c. Planned pupil capacity of each school:

1. New Kent High School 207, New Kent Elementary School 330.
2. George W. Watkins High School 207, George W. Watkins Elementary School 420.

d. Pupils by grades—New Kent (All White)

Elementary: 1-54; 2-61; 3-51; 4-57; 5-48; 6-54; 7-42.

High School: 8-41; 9-49; 10-42; 11-33; 12-20.

e. Pupils by grades—George W. Watkins (All Colored)

Elementary: 1-87; 2-73; 3-94; 4-79; 5-60; 6-77; 7-68.

High School: 8-49; 9-43; 10-34; 11-37; 12-38.

f. Negro school—1 Principal, 1 Librarian, 26 Teachers, 1 Supervisor, 1 Counselor

White school—1 Principal, 1 Librarian, 26 Teachers, 1 Supervisor, 1 Counselor

g. Pupil-teacher ratio at each school during 1964-65 school term: New Kent-22—George W. Watkins-28

h. Average class size for each school during 1964-65 school term, Grades 1-12: New Kent-21—George W. Watkins-26

i. Name and address of principal of each school: Gerald W. Tudor, New Kent High School, New Kent Virginia; Todd W. Dillard, George W. Watkins High School, Quinton, Va.

2. New Kent County has no attendance areas. A map of the County may be obtained from the Virginia Department of Highways.

3. As stated in No. 2 above, New Kent County is not divided into school attendance areas.

4. Eleven school buses transport pupils to the George W. Watkins school. Ten school buses transport pupils to the New Kent School. One bus transports 18 Indian children to a Charles City School. By agreement this bus also transports 60 Charles City children.

White pupils transported—548

Negro pupils transported—710

5. Bus routes in 1963-64 and 1964-65 are the same. See attached maps—names of drivers of buses are shown on maps. (Exhibits A and B)

6. As stated in No. 2 and 3 above, New Kent County is not divided into attendance areas.

7. New Kent County Schools have been operated on a Freedom of Choice Plan administered by the State Pupil Placement Board since the establishment of the Pupil Placement Board. To September 1964, no Negro pupil had applied for admission to the New Kent School and no White pupil had applied for admission to the George W. Watkins School.

8. Both schools are crowded beyond capacity in the high school departments.

New Kent High School: Two basement areas, a conference room, stage dressing room, and the auditorium are used for classes.

George W. Watkins High School: Two basement areas, clinic room, and a part of the Vocational Shop are used for classes.

9. Distributive Education is not offered in either school.

10. There are special teachers for subjects such as art and music.

11. a. New Kent High School—Part-time music teacher. George W. Watkins High School—Part-time music

teacher. New Kent Elementary School—Part-time music teacher.

- b. One—New Kent School—Full time.
- c. One—George W. Watkins School—Part-time.
- d. Stated in b. and c.
- e. Same as stated in b. and c.

12. Vocational Home Economics and Vocational Agriculture were offered in both schools during 1963-64 and during 1964-65.

13. Substantially the same for 1964-65 and 1963-64.

New Kent High School offered Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics. Vocational Agriculture: 1 teacher, 63 pupils. Home Economics: 1 teacher, 32 pupils.

George W. Watkins High School offered Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics. Vocational Agriculture: 1 teacher, 52 pupils. Home Economics: 1 teacher, 56 pupils.

14. New Kent County has no junior high schools. Each of the two schools are operated on the plan called the 7-5 plan, which consists of 7 elementary grades and 5 high school grades.

Each high school offers the following: Academic Curriculum, Vocational Curriculum, General Course.

The Academic Curriculum is geared mainly for pupils preparing for college.

The Vocational Course is offered pupils not planning for college, and a boy may major in Agriculture; a girl in Home Making; and a boy or girl may major in Commercial courses.

Those pupils planning to seek work in general employment may enroll in a general course.

Each high school has a guidance counselor who attempts to aid the pupil and parent in the selection of a course according to the pupil's aptitude and his desired type of employment after graduation.

15. New Kent County has no Seventh grade pupils who take courses in the high school department.

Each school in New Kent County is a combination high school and elementary school, but teachers do not work partly in high school and partly in elementary school.

16. The School Board of New Kent County offers no summer school program in any school.

17. At the George W. Watkins School the Agriculture building is a frame building.

18. Extensive repairs were made at both schools during the summer of 1963 and 1964. No major repairs are needed at either school at the present time.

19. a. New Kent School—campus type addition. George W. Watkins School campus type addition.

b. New Kent School—4 classrooms planned; 2 seventh grade classrooms; 2 sixth grade classrooms; two toilets to serve the four rooms. This addition will serve 6th & 7th grade pupils at the above school. George

W. Watkins School—4 classrooms planned: 2 seventh grade classrooms; 2 sixth grade classrooms; two toilets to serve the four rooms. This addition will serve 6th & 7th grade pupils at the above school.

c. A completion date has not been set for this project as State Literary Loan funds have not been released.

The two above projects will be let to bid at the same time and one contract will be executed for both of the projects.

d. New Kent County has no attendance areas.

20. George W. Watkins High School and Grade School:

a. Todd W. Dillard, Principal, Male, age 30, Negro

b. Employed April, 1964, effective July 1, 1964

c. Four years experience

d. B.S. Virginia State College—Work completed for Masters Degree

e. Science and Mathematics Major

f. Collegiate Professional Certificate

g. Does not teach—full-time Principal

h. Rated as superior

New Kent High School and Grade School:

a. Gerald W. Tudor, Principal, Male, age 28, White

b. Employed July 14, 1964

c. Five years experience

d. B.S. East Carolina College—Work completed for

Masters Degree

- e. Physical Education
- f. Collegiate Professional Certificate
- g. Does not teach—full-time Principal

For information regarding teachers, see attached Exhibit "C".

21. Records in the School Board Office will reflect the turnover of teachers in each school.

22. Contract with teachers are executed annually for a period of one year. A report of teachers contracted with for each year is filed in the school board office.

- a. As stated above
- b. For past 5 years
- c. School Board Office
- d. The Clerk of the School Board

23. Teachers' attendance registers record entries, re-entries and withdrawals. No other special records are kept.

24. Teachers registers

- a. Same as above
- b. School Board Office
- c. Clerk of School Board

25. Federal Funds 1963-64

School Lunch	\$ 4,554.68
PL 874	9,612.00
NDEA	1,572.00
Guidance	2,000.00
 Total	 \$17,738.68

Federal Funds—Estimated—1964-65	
School Lunch	\$ 5,500.00
PL 874	9,800.00
NDEA	1,750.00
Guidance	2,000.00
 Total	 <hr/> \$19,050.00

26. Yes

HEW Form 441

27. Plan to accompany HEW Form 441 has not been completed at this date.

/s/ BYRD W. LONG

Byrd W. Long, Division Superintendent of Schools of New Kent County, Virginia

• • • •

Exhibit C**20. *Continued***

Paul Gilley, age 22, white, male, b. 1963, c. None, d. V.P.I., B.S., e. Agriculture, f. Collegiate Professional, Agricultural, g. Agriculture, New Kent High School, h. Teachers are not rated in this Division.

Edward J. Stansfield, age 24, white, male, b. 1961, c. None, d. Houghton, B.A., e. Sociology, f. Collegiate, Sociology, History, English, g. History, English, New Kent High School.

Billy R. Ricks, age 21, white, male, b. 1964, c. None, d. East Carolina, B.A., e. History and Social Science, f. Collegiate History and Social Science, g. History, New Kent High School.

John E. Averett, age 25, white, male, b. 1963, c. 2 years, d. University of Richmond, no degree, e. Physical Education, f. Special License, g. Math, Physical Education, New Kent High School.

Jayne P. Thomas, age 31, white, female, b. 1962, c. 2 years, d. Madison, B.M. Education, e. Music, f. Collegiate Professional, Music, g. Music, New Kent High and Elementary School.

Mary W. Potts, age 38, white, female, b. 1963, c. 4 years, d. Longwood, B.S., e. English, Chemistry, f. Collegiate Professional 6th and 7th grades, g. 7th grade, New Kent Elementary School.

Alice V. Fisher, age 56, white, female, b. 1963, c. 16 years, d. Mary Washington, no degree, e. Elementary Education, f. Special License, g. 5th grade, New Kent Elementary.

Shirley F. Francisco, age 31, white, female, b. 1964, c. 2 years, d. Madison, no degree, e. Elementary Education, f. Special License, g. 2nd grade, New Kent Elementary.

Patricia B. Averett, age 20, white, female, b. 1963, c. None, d. Ferrum, no degree, e. Elementary Education, f. Special License, g. 1st grade, New Kent Elementary School.

Murray Carson, age 53, white, male, b. 1964, c. None, d. Averett, no degree, e. English and History, f. Special License, g. 1/2 day English, New Kent High School.

Laurenstine Porter, age 22, Negro, female, b. 1964, c. None, d. North Carolina College B.S., e. Library, f. Collegiate, Health and Physical Education, Library Science, g. Librarian, G. W. Watkins High & Elementary School.

Guy A. Boykins, age 57, Negro, male, b. 1960, c. None, d. Virginia Union University, A.B., e. Social Studies and History, f. Collegiate Professional, English, g. Social Studies and History, G. W. Watkins High School.

James E. Coleman, age 23, Negro, male, b. 1964, c. None, d. Virginia Union, no degree, e. Chemistry, f. Special License, Science and Physical Education, g. Science and Physical Education, G. W. Watkins High School.

Edith Jackson, age 24, Negro, female, b. 1960, c. None, d. Virginia Union, B.S., e. Business, f. Collegiate Professional, Business, g. Commercial, G. W. Watkins High School.

Gloria Miller, age 41, Negro, female, b. 1964, c. 2 years, d. Virginia Union, B.A., e. Elementary, f. Collegiate Professional—English and History, g. English and French, G. W. Watkins High School.

John A. Baker, age 39, Negro, male, b. 1961, c. 13 years, d. Wilburforce University, B.S., e. Agriculture, f. Collegiate Professional, g. Agriculture, G. W. Watkins High School.

Charles J. Washington, Sr., age 53, Negro, male, b. 1962, c. None, d. Virginia Union, B.A., e. English, f. Collegiate Professional—English and Latin, g. English, G. W. Watkins High School.

Seth Pruden, age 37, Negro, male, b. 1960, c. None, d. Virginia Union, B.S., e. History, f. Collegiate Professional—French and History, g. 7th grade, G. W. Watkins Elementary School.

Phillip Battle, age 24, Negro, male, b. 1963, c. None, d. St. Paul's, B.A., e. History and Social Sciences, f. Collegiate—History and Social Sciences, g. 7th grade, G. W. Watkins Elementary School.

Natalie Boykins, age 24, Negro, female, b. 1964, c. 2 years, d. Virginia State, B.A., e. Sociology, f. Collegiate—Sociology, g. 6th grade, G. W. Watkins Elementary School.

Julia Boyce, age 34, Negro, female, b. 1961, c. 10 years, d. Virginia State, B.S., e. English and Physical Education, f. Collegiate Professional—All grade subjects in 6th and 7th, g. 5th grade, G. W. Watkins Elementary School.

Willie Gillenwater, age 34, Negro, female, b. 1963, c. 2, d. Virginia Union, B.A., e. Elementary Education, f. Collegiate Professional—English, g. 4th grade, G. W. Watkins School—Elementary.

Audrey Dillard, age 28, Negro, female, b. 1963, c. 6 years, d. Virginia State, A.B., e. Social Studies, f. Collegiate Professional—History, g. 4th Grade, G. W. Watkins School—Elementary.

Dorothy Joyner, age 28, Negro, female, b. 1961, c. 3 years, d. Winston Salem, B.S., e. English & History, f. Collegiate Professional—Elementary, g. 2nd grade, G. W. Watkins School—Elementary.

Susie Bates, age 23, Negro, female, b. 1962, c. None, d. Virginia State, B.S., e. Elementary, f. Collegiate Professional—Grades 1-7, g. 1st grade, G. W. Watkins School—Elementary.

Plan for School Desegregation

(Filed May 10, 1966)

**NEW KENT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PROVIDENCE FORGE, VIRGINIA****I. ANNUAL FREEDOM OF CHOICE OF SCHOOLS**

- A. The County School Board of New Kent County has adopted a policy of complete freedom of choice to be offered in grades 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of all schools without regard to race, color, or national origin, for 1965-66 and all grades after 1965-66.
- B. The choice is granted to parents, guardians and persons acting as parents (hereafter called "parents") and their children. Teachers, principals and other school personnel are not permitted to advise, recommend or otherwise influence choices. They are not permitted to favor or penalize children because of choices.

II. PUPILS ENTERING FIRST GRADE

Registration for the first grade will take place, after conspicuous advertising two weeks in advance of registration, between April 1 and May 31 from 9:00 A. M. to 2:00 P. M.

When registering, the parent will complete a Choice of School Form for the child. The child may be registered at any elementary school in this system, and the choice made may be for that

school or for any other elementary school in the system. The provisions of Section VI of this plan with respect to overcrowding shall apply in the assignment to schools of children entering first grade.

III. PUPILS ENTERING OTHER GRADES

- A. Each parent will be sent a letter annually explaining the provisions of the plan, together with a Choice of School Form and a self-addressed return envelope, by April 1 of each year for pre-school children and May 15 for others. Choice forms and copies of the letter to parents will also be readily available to parents or students and the general public in the school offices during regular business hours. Section VI applies.
- B. The Choice of School Form must be either mailed or brought to any school or to the Superintendent's Office by May 31st of each year. Pupils entering grade one (1) of the elementary school or grade eight (8) of the high school must express a choice as a condition for enrollment. Any pupil in grades other than grades 1 and 8 for whom a choice of school is not obtained will be assigned to the school he is now attending.

IV. PUPILS NEWLY ENTERING SCHOOL SYSTEM OR CHANGING RESIDENCE WITHIN IT

- A. Parents of children moving into the area served by this school system, or changing their residence within it, after the registration period is com-

pleted but before the opening of the school year, will have the same opportunity to choose their children's school just before school opens during the week of August 30th, by completing a Choice of School Form. The child may be registered at any school in the system containing the grade he will enter, and the choice made may be for that school or for any other such school in the system. However, first preference in choice of schools will be given to those whose Choice of School Form is returned by the final date for making choice in the regular registration period. Otherwise, Section VI applies.

- B. Children moving into the area served by this school system, or changing their residence within it, after the late registration period referred to above but before the next regular registration period, shall be provided with registration forms. This has been done in the past.

V. RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT ATTENDANCE

This system will not accept non-resident students, nor will it make arrangements for resident students to attend public schools in other school systems where either action would tend to preserve segregation or minimize desegregation. Any arrangement made for non-resident students to attend public schools in this system, or for resident students to attend public schools in another system, will assure that such students will be assigned without regard to race, color, or national origin, and such arrangement will be ex-

plained fully in an attachment made a part of this plan. Agreement attached for Indian children.

VI. OVERCROWDING

- A. No choice will be denied for any reason other than overcrowding. Where a school would become overcrowded if all choices for that school were granted, pupils choosing that school will be assigned so that they may attend the school of their choice nearest to their homes. No preference will be given for prior attendance at the school.
- B. The Board plans to relieve overcrowding by building during 1965-66 for the 1966-67 session.

VII. TRANSPORTATION

Transportation will be provided on an equal basis without segregation or other discrimination because of race, color, or national origin. The right to attend any school in the system will not be restricted by transportation policies or practices. To the maximum extent feasible, busses will be routed so as to serve each pupil choosing any school in the system. In any event, every student eligible for bussing shall be transported to the school of his choice if he chooses either the formerly white, Negro or Indian school.

VIII. SERVICES, FACILITIES, ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

There shall be no discrimination based on race, color, or national origin with respect to any ser-

vices, facilities, activities and programs sponsored by or affiliated with the schools of this school system.

IX. STAFF DESEGREGATION

- A. Teacher and staff desegregation is a necessary part of school desegregation. Steps shall be taken beginning with school year 1965-66 toward elimination of segregation of teaching and staff personnel based on race, color, or national origin, including joint faculty meetings, in-service programs, workshops, other professional meetings and other steps as set forth in Attachment C.
- B. The race, color, or national origin of pupils will not be a factor in the initial assignment to a particular school or within a school of teachers, administrators or other employees who serve pupils, beginning in 1966-67.
- C. This school system will not demote or refuse to reemploy principals, teachers and other staff members who serve pupils, on the basis of race, color, or national origin; this includes any demotion or failure to reemploy staff members because of actual or expected loss of enrollment in a school.
- D. Attachment D hereto consists of a tabular statement, broken down by race, showing: 1) the number of faculty and staff members employed by this system in 1964-65; 2) comparable data for 1965-66; 3) the number of such personnel demoted, discharged or not reemployed for 1965-66; 4)

the number of such personnel newly employed for 1965-66. Attachment D further consists of a certification that in each case of demotion, discharge or failure to reemploy, such action was taken wholly without regard to race, color, or national origin.

X. PUBLICITY AND COMMUNITY PREPARATION

Immediately upon the acceptance of this plan by the U. S. Commissioner of Education, and once a month before final date of making choices in 1966, copies of this plan will be made available to all interested citizens and will be given to all television and radio stations and all newspapers serving this area. They will be asked to give conspicuous publicity to the plan in local news section of the Richmond papers. The newspaper coverage will set forth the text of the plan, the letter to parents and Choice of School Form. Similar prominent notice of the choice provision will be arranged for at least once a month thereafter until the final date for making choice. In addition, meetings and conferences have been and will be called to inform all school system staff members of, and to prepare them for, the school desegregation process, including staff desegregation. Similar meetings will be held to inform Parent-Teacher Associations and other local community organizations of the details of the plan, to prepare them for the changes that will take place.

XL CERTIFICATION

This plan of desegregation was duly adopted by
the New Kent County School Board at a meeting
duly called and held on August 2, 1965.

Signed:

(Chairman, Superintendent or
other authorized official)

.....
(title of signing officer)

Attachment A

(School Board Letterhead)

Date Sent to Parents
and Guardians:

May 15, 1966

CHOICE OF SCHOOL FORM

This form is provided for you to choose a school for your child to go to next year. The form must be either mailed or brought to any school or to the Superintendent's office at the address above by May 31, 1966.

1. Name of Child

 Last First Middle

2. Date of Pupil's Birth (if entering first grade)

 Month

 Day Year

3. Grade Pupil Eligible for

4. School Last Attended

5. School Chosen (Mark X beside school chosen)

- George W. Watkins High and Elementary
1-12 Quinton, Virginia
- New Kent High and Elementary
142 New Kent, Virginia
- Samaria School (Indian)
1-12 Charles City, Va.

Signature

Address

Date

This block is to be filled in by the Superintendent's office,
not by parents. School chosen: School as-
signed to: If different, explain:
.....

Attachment B

(School Board Letterhead)

May 15, 1966

Dear Parent:

A plan for the desegregation of our school system has been put into effect so that our schools will operate in all respects without regard to race, color, or national origin.

The desegregation plan provides that each pupil and his parent or guardian has the absolute right to choose each year the school the pupil will attend. No teacher, principal, or other school official is permitted to advise you, or make recommendations or otherwise influence your decision. No child will be favored or penalized because of the choice made.

Attached is a Choice of School Form listing the names and locations of all schools in our system and the grades they include. Please mark a cross beside the school you choose, and return the form in the enclosed envelope or bring it to any school or the Superintendent's office by May 31, 1966.

No choice will be denied for any reason other than over-crowding. Anyone whose choice is denied because of over-crowding will be offered his choice from among all other schools in the system where space is available in his grade.

School bus routes will be on a desegregated basis. There will be no discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in any school-connected services, facilities, activities and programs.

For pupils entering grades one (1) and eight (8) a Choice of School Form must be filled out as a requirement for enrollment. Children in other grades for whom no choice is made will be assigned to the school they are presently attending.

Sincerely yours,

Superintendent

Attachment C**Additional Steps Toward Staff Desegregation**

Below are possible steps toward faculty and staff desegregation which have been taken in other school systems and one or more of which you may deem appropriate for your system to adopt at this time. Please indicate by checking the appropriate box or boxes and attach this page to the plan when submitting it.

1. All members of the supervisory staff will be assigned to serve schools, teachers and pupils without regard to race, color or national origin.
2. Teachers and staff members who serve more than one school, such as librarians, music and art teachers, nurses, counselors will be assigned to serve schools, teachers and pupils without regard to race, color, or national origin.
3. During the first semester of 1965-66, "pioneer teachers" of both races will be selected and given special preparation and, during the second semester of school year 1965-66, assigned to exchange classrooms and schools periodically.
4. Institutions, agencies, organizations and individuals that refer teachers and staff to school systems in this State will, during school year 1965-66 be informed of this school system's policy of nondiscrimination in filling positions for serving pupils in this school system and they will be asked to so inform persons seeking referrals.

5. In the future, there will be no requirement or request for the photograph of or racial identification of applicants for employment, reemployment or reassignment.
6. All teaching vacancies will be prominently posted in all schools and applicants will be considered without regard to race, color or national origin.
7. No new teacher will hereafter be employed who is not willing to work on a completely desegregated basis.
8. Other steps as follows:

First Memorandum of the District Court

(Filed May 17, 1966)

The infant plaintiffs, as pupils or prospective pupils in the public schools of New Kent County, and their parents or guardians have brought this class action asking that the defendants be required to adopt and implement a plan which will provide for the prompt and efficient racial desegregation of the county schools, and that the defendants be enjoined from building schools or additions and from purchasing school sites pending the court's approval of a plan. The plaintiffs also seek attorney's fees and costs.

The defendants have moved to dismiss on the ground that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. They have also answered denying the material allegations of the bill.

The facts are uncontested.

New Kent is a rural county located east of the City of Richmond. Its school system serves approximately 1,300 pupils, of which 740 are Negro and 550 are White. The school board operates one white combined elementary and high school, and one Negro combined elementary and high school. There are no attendance zones. Each school serves the entire county. Indian students attend a school in Charles City County.

On August 2, 1965 the county school board adopted a freedom of choice plan to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U. S. C. §2000d-1, *et seq.* The choices include the Indian school in Charles City County. The county had operated under the Pupil Placement Act, §§22-232.1, *et seq.*, Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended. As of September 1964 no Negro pupil had applied for

admission to the white school. No Negro faculty member serves in the white school and no white faculty member serves in the Negro school.

New construction is scheduled at both county schools.

The case is controlled by the principles expressed in *Wright v. School Bd. of Greenville County, Va.*, No. 4263 (E. D. Va., Jan. 27, 1966). An order similar to that entered in *Greenville* will deny an injunction restraining construction and grant leave to submit an amendment to the plan for employment and assignment of staff on a non-racial basis. The motion for counsel fees will be denied.

/s/ JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR.
United States District Judge

First Order of the District Court

(Filed May 17, 1966)

For reasons stated in the Memorandum of the Court this day filed in the Memorandum of the Court in *Wright v. County School Board of Greenville County, Virginia*, Civil Action No. 4263 (E. D. Va., Jan. 27, 1966),

It is ADJUDGED and ORDERED:

1. The defendants' motion to dismiss is denied;
2. The plaintiffs' prayer for an injunction restraining school construction and the purchase of school sites is denied;
3. The defendants are granted leave to submit on or before June 6, 1966 amendments to their plan which will provide for employment and assignment of the staff on a non-racial basis. Pending receipt of these amendments, the court will refer approval of the plan and consideration of other injunctive relief;
4. The plaintiffs' motion for counsel fees is denied;
5. The case will be retained upon the docket with leave granted to any party to petition for further relief.

The plaintiffs shall recover their costs to date.

Let the Clerk send copies of this order and the Memorandum of the Court to counsel of record.

/s/ JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR.
United States District Judge

Defendants' Plan Supplement

(Filed June 6, 1966)

The School Board of New Kent County recognizes its responsibility to employ, assign, promote and discharge teachers and other professional personnel of the school systems without regard to race, color or national origin. We further recognize our obligation to take all reasonable steps to eliminate existing racial segregation of faculty that has resulted from the past operation of a dual system based upon race or color.

The New Kent Board recognizes the fact that New Kent County has a problem which differs from most counties in that the white citizens are the minority group. The Board is also cognizant of the fact that race relations are generally good in this county, and Negro citizens share in county government. A Negro citizen is a member of the County Board of Supervisors at the present time.

In the recruitment, selection and assignment of staff, the chief obligation is to provide the best possible education for all children. The pattern of assignment of teachers and other staff members among the various schools of this system will not be such that only white teachers are sought for predominantly white schools and only Negro teachers are sought for predominantly Negro schools.

The following procedures will be followed to carry out the above stated policy:

1. The best person will be sought for each position without regard to race, and the Board will follow the policy of assigning new personnel in a manner that will work toward the desegregation of faculties. We will not select a person of less ability just to accomplish desegregation.

2. Institutions, agencies, organization, and individuals that refer teacher applicants to the school system will be informed of the above stated policy for faculty desegregation and will be asked to so inform persons seeking referrals.
3. The School Board will take affirmative steps to allow teachers presently employed to accept transfers to schools in which the majority of the faculty members are of a race different from that of the teacher to be transferred.
4. No new teacher will be hereafter employed who is not willing to accept assignment to a desegregated faculty or in a desegregated school.
5. All Workshops and in-service training programs are now and will continue to be conducted on a completely desegregated basis.
6. All members of the supervisory staff will be assigned to cover schools, grades, teachers and pupils without regard to race, color or national origin.
7. All staff meetings and committee meetings that are called to plan, choose materials, and to improve the total educational process of the division are now and will continue to be conducted on a completely desegregated basis.
8. All custodial help, cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, bus mechanics and the like will continue to be employed without regard to race, color or national origin.
9. Arrangements will be made for teachers of one race to visit and observe a classroom consisting of a teacher and pupils of another race to promote acquaintance and understanding.

Plaintiffs' Exception to Plan Supplement

(Filed June 10, 1966)

The plaintiffs take exception to the defendants' Plan Supplement adopted May 23, 1966 and filed herein pursuant to leave granted in this Court's order of May 17, 1966 to submit amendments which will provide for employment and assignment of the staff on a non-racial basis.

I

The Supplement does not contain well-defined procedures which will be put into effect on definite dates. The Supplement does not even provide the "token assignments" which this Court warned would not suffice.

II

In all reality, the Supplement states the defendant school board's refusal to take any initiative to desegregate the faculties of the several schools.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs pray that their exceptions be sustained and that the defendants be required to forthwith eliminate all facets of racial segregation and discrimination with respect to administrative personnel, teachers, clerical, custodial and other employees, transportation and other facilities, and the assignment of pupils to schools and classrooms in the public schools of New Kent County and that the defendants be required to establish geographic attendance areas for each public school in said county and assign each child to the school so designated to serve his area of residence.

/s/ S. W. TUCKER
Of Counsel for Plaintiffs

Memorandum of the Court

(Filed June 28, 1966)

This memorandum supplements the memorandum of the court filed May 17, 1966. The court deferred ruling on the school board's plan of desegregation until after the board had an opportunity to amend the plan to provide for allocation of faculty and staff on a non-racial basis. The board has filed a supplement to the plan to accomplish this purpose.

The plan and supplement are:

I.**ANNUAL FREEDOM OF CHOICE OF SCHOOLS**

A. The County School Board of New Kent County has adopted a policy of complete freedom of choice to be offered in grades 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of all schools without regard to race, color, or national origin, for 1965-66 and all grades after 1965-66.

B. The choice is granted to parents, guardians and persons acting as parents (hereafter called 'parents') and their children. Teachers, principals and other school personnel are not permitted to advise, recommend or otherwise influence choices. They are not permitted to favor or penalize children because of choices.

II.**PUPILS ENTERING OTHER GRADES**

Registration for the first grade will take place, after conspicuous advertising two weeks in advance of registration, between April 1 and May 31 from 9:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

When registering, the parent will complete a Choice of

Memorandum of the Court

School Form for the child. The child may be registered at any elementary school in this system, and the choice made may be for that school or for any other elementary school in the system. The provisions of Section VI of this plan with respect to overcrowding shall apply in the assignment to schools of children entering first grade.

III.**PUPILS ENTERING OTHER GRADES**

A. Each parent will be sent a letter annually explaining the provisions of the plan, together with a Choice of School Form and a self-addressed return envelope, by April 1 of each year for pre-school children and May 15 for others. Choice forms and copies of the letter to parents will also be readily available to parents or students and the general public in the school offices during regular business hours. Section VI applies.

B. The Choice of School Form must be either mailed or brought to any school or to the Superintendent's Office by May 31st of each year. Pupils entering grade one (1) of the elementary school or grade eight (8) of the high school must express a choice as a condition for enrollment. Any pupil in grades other than grades 1 and 8 for whom a choice of school is not obtained will be assigned to the school he is now attending.

IV.**PUPILS NEWLY ENTERING SCHOOL SYSTEM OR
CHANGING RESIDENCE WITHIN IT**

A. Parents of children moving into the area served by this school system, or changing their residence within it,

Memorandum of the Court

after the registration period is completed but before the opening of the school year, will have the same opportunity to choose their children's school just before school opens during the week of August 30th, by completing a Choice of School Form. The child may be registered at any school in the system containing the grade he will enter, and the choice made may be for that school or for any other such school in the system. However, first preference in choice of schools will be given to those whose Choice of School Form is returned by the final date for making choice in the regular registration period. Otherwise, Section VI applies.

B. Children moving into the area served by this school system, or changing their residence within it, after the late registration period referred to above but before the next regular registration period, shall be provided with registration forms. This has been done in the past.

V.

RESIDENT AND NON-RESIDENT ATTENDANCE

This system will not accept non-resident students, nor will it make arrangements for resident students to attend public schools in other school systems where either action would tend to preserve segregation or minimize desegregation. Any arrangement made for non-resident students to attend public schools in this system, or for resident students to attend public schools in another system, will assure that such students will be assigned without regard to race, color, or national origin, and such arrangement will be explained fully in an attachment made a part of this plan. Agreement attached for Indian children.

Memorandum of the Court

VI.

OVERCROWDING

A. No choice will be denied for any reason other than overcrowding. Where a school would become overcrowded if all choices for that school were granted, pupils choosing that school will be assigned so that they may attend the school of their choice nearest to their homes. No preference will be given for prior attendance at the school.

B. The Board plans to relieve overcrowding by building during 1965-66 for the 1966-67 session.

VII.

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation will be provided on an equal basis without segregation or other discrimination because of race, color, or national origin. The right to attend any school in the system will not be restricted by transportation policies or practices. To the maximum extent feasible, busses will be routed so as to serve each pupil choosing any school in the system. In any event, every student eligible for bussing shall be transported to the school of his choice if he chooses either the formerly white, Negro or Indian school.

VIII.

SERVICES, FACILITIES, ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

There shall be no discrimination based on race, color, or national origin with respect to any services, facilities, activities and programs sponsored by or affiliated with the schools of this school system.

*Memorandum of the Court***IX.****STAFF DESSEGREGATION**

- A. Teacher and staff desegregation is a necessary part of school desegregation. Steps shall be taken beginning with school year 1965-66 toward elimination of segregation of teaching and staff personnel based on race, color, or national origin, including joint faculty meetings, in-service programs, workshops, other professional meetings and other steps as set forth in Attachment C.
- B. The race, color, or national origin of pupils will not be a factor in the initial assignment to a particular school or within a school of teachers, administrators or other employees who serve pupils, beginning in 1966-67.
- C. This school system will not demote or refuse to re-employ principals, teachers and other staff members who serve pupils, on the basis of race, color, or national origin; this includes any demotion or failure to reemploy staff members because of actual or expected loss of enrollment in a school.
- D. Attachment D hereto consists of a tabular statement, broken down by race, showing: 1) the number of faculty and staff members employed by this system in 1964-65; 2) comparable data for 1965-66; 3) the number of such personnel demoted, discharged or not re-employed for 1965-66; 4) the number of such personnel newly employed for 1965-66. Attachment D further consists of a certification that in each case of demotion, discharge or failure to re-employ, such action was taken wholly without regard to race, color, or national origin.

Memorandum of the Court.

X.

PUBLICITY AND COMMUNITY PREPARATION

Immediately upon the acceptance of this plan by the U. S. Commissioner of Education, and once a month before final date of making choices in 1966, copies of this plan will be made available to all interested citizens and will be given to all television and radio stations and all newspapers serving this area. They will be asked to give conspicuous publicity to the plan in local news sections of the Richmond papers. The newspaper coverage will set forth the text of the plan, the letter to parents and Choice of School Form. Similar prominent notice of the choice provision will be arranged for at least one a month thereafter until the final date for making choice. In addition, meetings and conferences have been and will be called to inform all school system staff members of, and to prepare them for, the school desegregation process, including staff desegregation. Similar meetings will be held to inform Parent-Teacher Associations and other local community organizations of the details of the plan, to prepare them for the changes that will take place.

SUPPLEMENT

"The School Board of New Kent County recognizes its responsibility to employ, assign, promote and discharge teachers and other professional personnel of the school systems without regard to race, color or national origin. We further recognize our obligation to take all reasonable steps to eliminate existing racial segregation of faculty that has resulted from the past operation of a dual system based upon race or color.

Memorandum of the Court

"The New Kent Board recognizes the fact that New Kent County has a problem which differs from most counties in that the white citizens are the minority group. The Board is also cognizant of the fact that race relations are generally good in this county, and Negro citizens share in county government. A Negro citizen is a member of the County Board of Supervisors at the present time.

"In the recruitment, selection and assignment of staff, the chief obligation is to provide the best possible education for all children. The pattern of assignment of teachers and other staff members among the various schools of this system will not be such that only white teachers are sought for predominantly white schools and only Negro teachers are sought for predominantly Negro schools.

"The following procedures will be followed to carry out the above stated policy:

1. The best person will be sought for each position without regard to race, and the Board will follow the policy of assigning new personnel in a manner that will work toward the desegregation of faculties. We will not select a person of less ability just to accomplish desegregation.

2. Institutions, agencies, organization, and individuals that refer teacher applicants to the schools system will be informed of the above stated policy for faculty desegregation and will be asked to so inform persons seeking referrals.

3. The School Board will take affirmative steps to allow teachers presently employed to accept transfers to schools in which the majority of the faculty members

Memorandum of the Court

are of a race different from that of the teacher to be transferred.

4. No new teacher will be hereafter employed who is not willing to accept assignment to a desegregated faculty or in a desegregated school.

5. All workshops and in-service training programs are now and will continue to be conducted on a completely desegregated basis.

6. All members of the supervisory staff will be assigned to cover schools, grades, teachers and pupils without regard to race, color or national origin.

7. All staff meetings and committee meetings that are called to plan, choose materials, and to improve the total educational process of the division are now and will continue to be conducted on a completely desegregated basis.

8. All custodial help, cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, bus mechanics and the like will continue to be employed without regard to race, color or national origin.

9. Arrangements will be made for teachers of one race to visit and observe a classroom consisting of a teacher and pupils of another race to promote acquaintance and understanding."

The plaintiffs filed exceptions to the supplement charging that it does not contain well defined procedures which will be put into effect on definite dates and that it demonstrates the board's refusal to take any initiative to desegregate the staff.

Memorandum of the Court

The plan for faculty desegregation is not as definite as some plans received from other school districts. The court is of the opinion, however, that no rigid formula should be required. The plan will enable the school board to achieve allocation of faculty and staff on a non-racial basis. The plan and supplement satisfy the criteria mentioned in *Wright v. School Board of Greensville County, Va.*, No. 4263 (E.D. Va., Jan. 27 and May 13, 1966).

Provision should be made for a registration period in the summer or immediately prior to the beginning of the 1966-67 term to allow pupils to exercise their choice of school. This is necessary because the supplement to the plan was adopted late in the school year. The summer or fall registration should present no administrative difficulties. Many of the schools which have adopted a freedom of choice plan provide for such registration as a matter of course.

It may become necessary for the board to modify the plan. It may become necessary to revoke in full or in part the approval that the court has given the plan. The case will remain on the docket for any of the parties to seek relief which future circumstances may require.

/s/ JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR.
United States District Judge

Order

(Entered June 28, 1966)

For reasons stated in the memorandum of the court this day filed and in *Wright v. School Board of Greensville County, Va.*, No. 4263 (E.D. Va., Jan. 27 and May 13, 1966), it is ADJUDGED and ORDERED that the plan adopted by the New Kent County School Board is approved.

This case will be retained on the docket with leave granted to any party to seek further relief.

Let the Clerk send copies of this order and of the memorandum of the court to counsel of record.

/s/ JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR.

United States District Judge

**Decision of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit**

No. 10,792.

Charles C. Green, Carroll A. Green and Robert C. Green,
infants, by Calvin C. Green and Mary O. Green,
their father and mother and next friends,
and all others of the plaintiffs,

Appellants,

versus

County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia, et al.,
Appellees.

**APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, AT RICHMOND.**

JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR., DISTRICT JUDGE.

(Argued January 9, 1967. Decided June 12, 1967.)

Before HAYNSWORTH, Chief Judge, and SOBELOFF, BOREMAN,
BRYAN, J. SPENCER BELL,* WINTER and CRAVEN, Circuit
Judges, sitting en banc.

S. W. Tucker (Henry L. Marsh, III, Willard H. Douglas,
Jr., Jack Greenberg and James M. Nabrit, III, on brief)
for Appellants, and Frederick T. Gray (Williams, Mullen
& Christian on brief) for Appellees.

* Judge Bell sat as a member of the Court when the case was heard
but died before it was decided.

*Decision of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit*

PER CURIAM:

The questions presented in this case are substantially the same as those we have considered and decided today in *Bowman v. County School Bd. of Charles City County*.¹ For the reasons stated there, the rulings of the District Court merit our substantial approval, but the case is necessarily remanded for further proceedings in accordance with the District Court's order and our opinion in *Bowman*.

Remanded.

¹ 4 Cir. F.2d (Decided this day). The special concurring opinion of Judge Sobeloff, in which Judge Winter joins, in *Bowman* is applicable to this case also.

**Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit.**

No. 10,793.

Shirlette L. Bowman, Rhoda M. Bowman, Mildred A. Bowman, Richard M. Bowman and Sandra L. Bowman, infants, by Richard M. Bowman, their father and next friend, and all others of the plaintiffs,

Appellants,

versus

County School Board of Charles City County,
Virginia, et al.,
Appellees.

**APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA, AT RICHMOND.**

JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR., DISTRICT JUDGE.

(Argued January 9, 1967. Decided June 12, 1967.)

Before HAYNSWORTH, Chief Judge, and SOBELOFF, BOREMAN, BRYAN, J. SPENCER BELL,* WINTER and CRAVEN, Circuit Judges, sitting en banc.

S. W. Tucker (Henry L. Marsh, III, Willard H. Douglas, Jr., Jack Greenberg and James M. Nabrit, III, on brief) for Appellants, and Frederick T. Gray (Williams, Mullen & Christian on brief) for Appellees.

* Judge Bell sat as a member of the Court when the case was heard but died before it was decided.

*Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit*

HAYNSWORTH, Chief Judge:

In this school case, the Negro plaintiffs attack, as a deprivation of their constitutional rights, a "freedom of choice" plan, under which each Negro pupil has an acknowledged "unrestricted right" to attend any school in the system he wishes. They contend that compulsive assignments to achieve a greater intermixture of the races, notwithstanding their individual choices, is their due. We cannot accept that contention, though a related point affecting the assignment of teachers is not without merit.

I

"Freedom of choice" is a phrase of many connotations. Employed as descriptive of a system of permissive transfers out of segregated schools in which the initial assignments are both involuntary and dictated by racial criteria, it is an illusion and an oppression which is constitutionally impermissible. Long since, this court has condemned it.¹ The burden of extracting individual pupils from discriminatory, racial assignments may not be cast upon the pupils or their parents. It is the duty of the school boards to eliminate the discrimination which inheres in such a system.

Employed as descriptive of a system in which each pupil, or his parents, must annually exercise an uninhibited choice, and the choices govern the assignments, it is a very different

¹ *Nesbit v. Statesville City Bd. of Educ.*, 4 Cir., 345 F.2d 333, 334 n. 3; *Bradley v. School Bd. of Educ. of City of Richmond*, 4 Cir., 345 F.2d 310, 319 & n. 18; *Wheeler v. Durham City Bd. of Educ.*, 4 Cir., 309 F.2d 630, 633; *Jeffers v. Whitley*, 4 Cir., 309 F.2d 621; *Marsh v. County School Bd. of Roanoke County*, 4 Cir., 305 F.2d 94; *Green v. School Bd. of City of Roanoke*, 4 Cir., 304 F.2d 118; *Hill v. School Bd. of City of Norfolk*, 4 Cir., 282 F.2d 473; *Jones v. School Bd. of City of Alexandria*, 4 Cir., 278 F.2d 72.

*Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit*

thing. If each pupil, each year, attends the school of his choice, the Constitution does not require that he be deprived of his choice unless its exercise is not free. This we have held,² and we adhere to our holdings.

Whether or not the choice is free may depend upon circumstances extraneous to the formal plan of the school board. If there is a contention that economic or other pressures in the community inhibit the free exercise of the choice, there must be a judicial appraisal of it, for "freedom of choice" is acceptable only if the choice is free in the practical context of its exercise. If there are extraneous pressures which deprive the choice of its freedom, the school board may be required to adopt affirmative measures to counter them.

A panel of the Fifth Circuit³ recently had occasion to concentrate its guns upon the sort of "freedom of choice" plan we have not tolerated; but, significantly, the decree it prescribed for its district courts requires the kind of "freedom of choice" plan we have held requisite and embodies standards no more exacting than those we have imposed and sanctioned.

The fact that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has approved the School Board's plan is not determinative. The actions of that department, as its guidelines, are entitled to respectful consideration, for, in large mea-

² Wheeler v. Durham City Bd. of Educ., 4 Cir., 346 F.2d 768, 773; Bradley v. School Bd. of Educ. of City of Richmond, 4 Cir., 345 F.2d 310, 313, vacated and remanded on other grounds, 382 U.S. 103. See Jeffers v. Whitley, 4 Cir., 309 F.2d 621.

³ United States v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 5 Cir., 372 F.2d 836, aff'd on rehearing en banc, F.2d; see also, Deal v. Cincinnati Board of Education, 6 Cir., 369 F.2d 55.

*Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit*

sure or entirely, they are a reflection of earlier judicial opinions. We reach our conclusion independently, for, while administrative interpretation may lend a persuasive gloss to a statute, the definition of constitutional standards controlling the actions of states and their subdivisions is peculiarly a judicial function.

Since the plaintiffs here concede that their annual choice is unrestricted and unencumbered, we find in its existence no denial of any constitutional right not to be subjected to racial discrimination.

II

Appropriately, the School Board's plan included provisions for desegregation of the faculties. Supplemented at the direction of the District Court, those provisions are set forth in the margin.⁴

⁴ The School Board of Charles City County recognizes its responsibility to employ, assign, promote and discharge teachers and other professional personnel of the school systems without regard to race, color or national origin. We further recognize our obligation to take all reasonable steps to eliminate existing racial segregation of faculty that has resulted from the past operation of a dual system based upon race or color.

In the recruitment, selection and assignment of staff, the chief obligation is to provide the best possible education for all children. The pattern of assignment of teachers and other staff members among the various schools of this system will not be such that only white teachers are sought for predominantly white schools and only Negro teachers are sought for predominantly Negro schools.

The following procedures will be followed to carry out the above stated policy:

1. The best person will be sought for each position without regard to race, and the Board will follow the policy of assigning new personnel in a manner that will work toward the desegregation of faculties.
2. Institutions, agencies, organizations, and individuals that refer teacher applicants to the school system will be informed of the

*Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit*

These the District Court found acceptable under our decision in *Wheeler v. Durham City Board of Education*, 363 F.2d 738, but retained jurisdiction to entertain applications for further relief. It acted upon a record which showed that white teachers had been assigned to the "Indian school"

above stated policy for faculty desegregation and will be asked to so inform persons seeking referrals.

3. The School Board will take affirmative steps including personal conferences with members of the present faculty to allow and encourage teachers presently employed to accept transfers to schools in which the majority of the faculty members are of a race different from that of the teacher to be transferred.
4. No new teacher will be hereafter employed who is not willing to accept assignment to a desegregated faculty or in a desegregated school.
5. All Workshops and in-service training programs are now and will continue to be conducted on a completely desegregated basis.
6. All members of the supervisory staff have been and will continue to be assigned to cover schools, grades, teachers and pupils without regard to race, color or national origin.
7. It is recognized that it is more desirous, where possible, to have more than one teacher of the minority race (white or Negro) on a desegregated faculty.
8. All staff meetings and committee meetings that are called to plan, choose materials, and to improve the total educational process of the division are now and will continue to be conducted on a completely desegregated basis.
9. All custodial help, cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, bus mechanics and the like will continue to be employed without regard to race, color or national origin.
10. Arrangements will be made for teachers of one race to visit and observe a classroom consisting of a teacher and pupils of another race to promote acquaintance and understanding.
11. The School Board and superintendent will exercise their best efforts, individually and collectively, to explain this program to school patrons and other citizens of Charles City County and to solicit their support of it.

*Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit*

and one Negro teacher had been assigned to a formerly all white school.

The appellants' complaint is that the plan is insufficiently specific in the absence of an immediate requirement of substantial interracial assignment of all teachers.

On this record, we are unable to say what impact such an order might have upon the school system or what administrative difficulties might be encountered in complying with it. Elimination of discrimination in the employment and assignment of teachers and administrative employees can be no longer deferred,⁵ but involuntary reassignment of teachers to achieve racial blending of faculties in each school is not a present requirement on the kind of record before us. Clearly, the District Court's retention of jurisdiction was for the purpose of swift judicial appraisal of the practical consequences of the School Board's plan and of the objective criteria by which its performance of its declared purposes could be measured.

An appeal having been taken, we lack the more current information which the District Court, upon application to it, could have commanded. Without such information, an order of remand, the inevitable result of this appeal, must be less explicit than the District Court's order, with the benefit of such information, might have been.

While the District Court's approval of the plan with its retention of jurisdiction may have been quite acceptable when entered, we think any subsequent order, in light of the appellants' complaints, should incorporate some minimal, objective time table.

⁵ Bradley v. School Bd. of Educ. of City of Richmond, 382 U.S. 103; Wheeler v. Durham City Bd. of Educ., 4 Cir., 363 F.2d 738.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

Quite recently, a panel of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals^{*} has required some progress in faculty integration for the school year 1967-68. By that decree, school boards are required to take affirmative steps to accomplish substantial desegregation of faculties in as many of the schools as possible for the 1967-68 school year and, wherever possible, to assign more than one member of the minority race to each desegregated faculty. As much should be required here. Indeed, since there was an earlier start in this case, the District Court, with the benefit of current information, should find it appropriate to fashion an order which is much more specific and more comprehensive. What is done on remand, however, must be done upon a supplemented record after an appraisal of the practical, administrative and other problems, if any, remaining to be solved and overcome.

Remanded.

SOBELOFF, Circuit Judge, with whom WINTER, Circuit Judge, joins, concurring specially.

Willingly, I join in the remand of the cases^{*} to the District Court, for I concur in what this court orders. I disagree, however, with the limited scope of the remand, for I think that the District Court should be directed not only to incorporate an objective timetable in the School Boards' plans for faculty desegregation, but also to set up proce-

* United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ., fn. 3, *supra*.

* This special concurrence is directed not only to *Bowman v. County School Bd. of Charles City County*, but also *Green v. County School Bd. of New Kent County*, F.2d, decided this day.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

dures for periodically evaluating the effectiveness of the Boards' "freedom of choice" plans in the elimination of other features of a segregated school system.

With all respect, I think that the opinion of the court is regrettably deficient in failing to spell out specific directions for the guidance of the District Court. The danger from an unspecific remand is that it may result in another round of unsatisfactory plans that will require yet another appeal and involve further loss of time. The bland discussion in the majority opinion must necessarily be pitched differently if the facts are squarely faced. As it is, the opinion omits almost entirely a factual recital. For an understanding of the stark inadequacy of the plans promulgated by the school authorities, it is necessary to explore the facts of the two cases.

New Kent County. Approximately 1,290 children attend the public schools of New Kent County. The system operated by the School Board consists of only two schools—the New Kent School, attended by all of the county's white pupils, and the Watkins School, attended by all of the county's Negro pupils.

There is no residential segregation and both races are diffused generally throughout the county. Yet eleven buses traverse the *entire* county to pick up the Negro students and carry them to the Watkins School, located in the western half of the county, and ten other buses traverse the *entire* county to pick up the white students for the New Kent School, located in the eastern half of the county. One additional bus takes the county's 18 Indian children to the "Indian" school, located in an adjoining county. Each of the county's two schools has 26 teachers and they offer identical programs of instruction.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

Repeated petitions from Negro parents, requesting the adoption of a plan to eliminate racial discrimination, were totally ignored. Not until some months after the present action had been instituted on March 15, 1965, did the School Board adopt its "freedom of choice" plan.¹

The above data relate to the 1964-1965 school year.² Since the Board's "freedom of choice" plan has now been in effect for two years as to grades 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 and one year as to all other grades, clearly this court's remand should embrace an order requiring an evaluation of the success of the plan's operation over that time span, not only as to faculty but as to pupil integration as well. While the court does not order an inquiry in the District Court as to pupil integration, it of course does not forbid it. Since the District Judge retained the case on the docket, the matter will be open on remand to a thorough appraisal.

Charles City County. Approximately 1,800 children attend public schools in Charles City County. As in New Kent County, Negroes and whites live in the same neighborhoods and, similarly, segregated buses (Negro, Indian and white) traverse many of the same routes to pick up their respective

¹ As this circuit has elsewhere said, "Such a last minute change of heart is suspect, to say the least." *Cypress v. The Newport News General & Nonsectarian Hospital Ass'n*, F.2d, (4th Cir. Mar. 9, 1967). See also *Lankford v. Gelston*, 364 F.2d 197, 203 (4th Cir. 1966). Of course, in the present case, the District Court has noted that the plan was adopted in order to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000.d-1 (1964), and thus ensure the flow of federal funds.

² These data are culled from answers to plaintiffs' interrogatories. Neither side has furnished us or the District Court with more recent data. In oral argument, the defendant replied obscurely and unspecifically to inquiries from the bench as to what progress the county had made.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

charges.³ The Board operates four schools in all—Ruthville, a combined elementary and high school exclusively for Negroes; Barnetts, a Negro elementary school; Charles City, a combined elementary and high school for whites; and Samaria, a combined elementary and high school for Indian children. Thus, as plaintiffs point out, the Board, well into the second decade after the 1954 *Brown* decision, still maintains “what is in effect three distinct school systems—each organized along racial lines—with hardly enough pupils for one system!”⁴ The District Court found that “the Negro elementary schools serve geographical areas. The other schools serve the entire county.”⁵ This contrasting treatment of the races plainly exposes the prevailing discrimination. For the 1964-65 school year, only eight Negro children were assigned to grades 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 at the all-white Charles City School—an instance of the feeblest and most inconsequential tokenism.

Again, as in New Kent County, Negro parents on several occasions fruitlessly petitioned the School Board to adopt a desegregation plan. This suit was instituted on March 15,

³ The Eighth Circuit has recently held that the operation of two school buses, one for Negro children and one for white, along the same route, is impermissible. “While we have no authority to strike down transportation systems because they are costly and inefficient, we must strike them down if their operation serves to discourage the desegregation of the school systems.” *Kelley v. Arkansas Public School District*, 35 U.S.L. WEEK 2619 (8th Cir. Apr. 12, 1967).

⁴ The Board seems to go to an extreme of inefficiency and expense in order to maintain the segregated character of its schools, indulging in the luxury of three separate high school departments to serve a total of approximately 600 pupils, 437 of whom are in one school, and three separate and overlapping bus services.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

1965 and the Board adopted the plan presently under consideration on August 6, 1965. Not until June 1966 did the Board assign a single Negro teacher to the all-white faculty at Charles City School. Apart from this faint gesture, however, the faculties of the Negro and white schools remain totally segregated.⁶

The majority opinion implies that this court has gone as far as the Fifth Circuit and that the "freedom of choice" plan which that circuit has directed its district courts to prescribe "embodies standards no more exacting than those we have imposed and sanctioned." If this court is willing to go as far as the Fifth Circuit has gone, I welcome the resolve.⁷ It may be profitable, therefore, to examine closely what the Court of Appeals of that jurisdiction has recently said and done.⁸ We may then see how much further our court needs to go to bring itself abreast of the Fifth Circuit.

⁶ Three of the Board's eight teachers in the 175 pupil "Indian" school are white, the other five are Indian.

The Board asserts that it is "earnestly" seeking white teachers for the nine existing vacancies in the Negro schools, but so far its efforts have not met with success. This is not surprising, considering that the Board has formally declared that it "does not propose to advertise vacancies in papers as this would likely cause people of both races to apply who are not qualified to teach."

⁷ A recent article in the Virginia Law Review declares the Fifth Circuit to be "at once the most prolific and the most progressive court in the nation on the subject of school desegregation." Dunn, *Title VI, the Guidelines and School Desegregation in the South*, 53 VA. L. REV. 42, 73 (1967).

⁸ United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ., ____ F.2d ____ (5th Cir. 1966), *aff'd on rehearing en banc*, ____ F.2d ____ (5th Cir., Mar. 29, 1967).

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

I. Pupils

Under the plans of both Charles City County and New Kent County, only children entering grades one or eight are required to express a choice. Freedom of choice is permitted children in all other grades, and "any pupil in grades other than grades 1 and 8 for whom a choice of school is not obtained will be assigned to the school he is now attending."

In sharp contrast, the Fifth Circuit has expressly abolished "permissive" freedom of choice and ordered *mandatory* annual free choice for *all* grades, and "any student who has not exercised his choice of school within a week after school opens shall be assigned to the school nearest his home . . .".⁹ This is all that plaintiffs have been vainly seeking in New Kent County—that students be assigned to the schools nearest their homes.

If, in our cases, those who failed to exercise a choice were to be assigned to the schools nearest their homes, as the Fifth Circuit plan provides, instead of to the schools they previously attended, as directed in the plans before us, there would be a measure of progress in overcoming discrimination. As it is, the plans manifestly perpetuate discrimination. In view of the situation found in New Kent County, where there is no residential segregation, the elimination of the dual school system and the establishment of a "unitary, non-racial system" could be readily achieved with a minimum of administrative difficulty by means of geographic zoning—simply by assigning students living in the eastern half of the county to the New Kent School and those living in the western half of the county to the Watkins

⁹ United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ., F.2d (5th Cir. Mar. 29, 1967) (en banc). (Emphasis supplied.)

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

School. Although a geographical formula is not universally appropriate, it is evident that here the Board, by separately busing Negro children across the entire county to the "Negro" school, and the white children to the "white" school, is deliberately maintaining a segregated system which would vanish with non-racial geographic zoning. The conditions in this county present a classical case for this expedient.

In Charles City County, *Negro* elementary school children are geographically zoned, while *white* elementary school children are not, despite the conceded fact that the children of both races live in all sections of the county. Surely this curious arrangement is continued to prop up and preserve the dual school system proscribed by the Constitution and interdicted by the Fifth Circuit . . .

"The Court holds that boards and officials administering public schools in this circuit have the affirmative duty under the Fourteenth Amendment to bring about an *integrated, unitary* school system in which there are no Negro schools and no white schools—just schools.

* * * In fulfilling this duty it is not enough for school authorities to offer Negro children the opportunity to attend formerly all-white schools. The necessity of overcoming the effects of the *dual school system* in this circuit requires integration of faculties, facilities, and activities, as well as students."¹⁰

The Fifth Circuit stresses that the goal is "a unitary, non-racial system" and the question is whether a free choice plan will materially further the attainment of this goal.

¹⁰ F.2d at (en banc). (Emphasis supplied.)

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

Stating that courts must continually check the sufficiency of school boards' progress toward the goal, the Fifth Circuit decree requires school authorities to report regularly to the district courts to enable them to evaluate compliance "by measuring the performance." In fashioning its decree, that circuit gave great weight to the percentages referred to in the HEW Guidelines,¹¹ declaring that they establish "minimum" standards

"for measuring the effectiveness of freedom of choice as a useful tool. * * * If the plan is ineffective, longer on promises than performance, the school officials charged with initiating and administering a unitary system have not met the constitutional requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment; *they should try other tools.*"¹²

¹¹ "[S]trong policy considerations support our holding that the standards of court-supervised desegregation should not be lower than the standards of HEW-supervised desegregation. The Guidelines, of course, cannot bind the courts; we are not abdicating any judicial responsibilities. [Footnote omitted.] But we hold that HEW's standards are substantially the same as this Court's standards. They are required by the Constitution and, as we construe them, are within the scope of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In evaluating desegregation plans, district courts should make few exceptions to the Guidelines and should carefully tailor those so as not to defeat the policies of HEW or the holding of this Court."

United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ., F.2d, (5th Cir., Dec. 29, 1966), *adopted en banc*, F.2d (5th Cir., Mar. 29, 1967). Cf. Cypress v. Newport News Gen. Hosp., F.2d, n.15 (4th Cir., Mar. 9, 1967).

¹² F.2d (Emphasis supplied.) The HEW Guidelines provide: (1) if 8 or 9 percent of the Negro students in a school district transferred from segregated schools during the first year of the plan, the total transfers the following year must be on the order of at least *twice* that percentage; (2) if only 4 or 5 percent transferred, a "substantial" increase in the transfers will be expected the following year—bringing the

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

"Freedom of choice" is not a sacred talisman; it is only a means to a constitutionally required end—the abolition of the system of segregation and its effects.¹³ If the means prove effective, it is acceptable, but if it fails to undo segregation, other means must be used to achieve this end. The school officials have the continuing duty to take whatever action may be necessary to create a "unitary, non-racial system."

While I would prefer it if this court were more explicit in establishing requirements for periodic reporting by the school officials, I assume that the District Court will do this, rather than place the burden upon the plaintiffs to collect the essential data to show whether the free choice

total to at least triple the percentage of the previous year; (3) if less than 4 percent transferred the previous year, then the rate of increase in total transfers for the following year must be proportionately greater than that under (2); and (4) if no students transferred under a free choice plan, then unless a very "substantial start" is made in the following year, the school authorities will "be required to adopt a different type of plan." HEW Reg. A., 45 C.F.R. § 181.54 (Supp. 1966).

In both New Kent County and Charles City County, at least some grades have operated under a "freedom of choice" plan for two years. In Charles City County, only 0.6% of the Negro students transferred to the white school for the 1964-65 session. Under the standards subscribed to by the Fifth Circuit, therefore, a minimum of 6% of the Negro pupils in that county should have transferred to the "white" school the following year. Less than this percentage would indicate that the free choice plan was "ineffective, longer on promises than performance," and that the school officials "should try other tools"—e.g., geographic zoning or pairing of grades.

In New Kent County, no Negro students transferred during the first year of the plan. Thus, unless the requisite "substantial start" was made the following year, school officials *must* adopt a different plan—one that will work.

¹³ Judge Wisdom, in *Singleton v. Jackson Munic. Separate School Dist.*, 355 F.2d 865, 871 (5th Cir. 1966), referred to "freedom of choice" plans as a "haphazard basis" for the administration of schools.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

plan is materially furthering the achievement of "a unitary, non-racial system."¹⁴

A significant aspect of the Fifth Circuit's recent decree that, by implication, this court has adopted, deserves explicit recognition. The *Jefferson County* decree orders school officials, "without delay," to take appropriate measures for the protection of Negro students who exercise a choice from "harassment, intimidation, threats, hostile words or acts, and similar behavior." Counsel for the school boards assured us in oral argument that relations between the races are good in these counties, and that no incidents would occur. Nevertheless, the *fear* of incidents may well intimidate Negroes who might otherwise elect to attend a "white" school.¹⁵ To minimize this fear school

¹⁴ See Section IX of the decree issued in *United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.*, F.2d, (5th Cir. Mar. 29, 1967) (en banc) providing for detailed reports to the district courts.

¹⁵ Various factors, some subtle and some not so subtle, operate effectively to maintain the *status quo* and keep Negro children in "their" schools. Some of these factors are listed in the recent report issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

"Freedom of choice plans accepted by the Office of Education have not disestablished the dual and racially segregated school systems involved, for the following reasons: a. Negro and white schools have tended to retain their racial identity; b. White students rarely elect to attend Negro schools; c. Some Negro students are reluctant to sever normal school ties, made stronger by the racial identification of their schools; d. Many Negro children and parents in Southern States, having lived for decades in positions of subservience, are reluctant to assert their rights; e. Negro children and parents in Southern States frequently will not choose a formerly all-white school because they fear retaliation and hostility from the white community; f. In some school districts in the South, school officials have failed to prevent or punish harassment by white children who have elected to attend white schools; g. In some areas in the South where Negroes have elected to attend formerly all-white schools, the Negro com-

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

officials must demonstrate unequivocally that protection will be provided. It is the duty of the school boards actively to oversee the process, to publicize its policy in all segments of the population and to enlist the cooperation of police and other community agencies.¹⁶

The plaintiffs vigorously assert that the adoption of the Board's free choice plan in Charles City County, without further action toward equalization of facilities, will not cure present gross inequities characterizing the dual school system. A glaring example is the assignment of 135 commercial students to one teacher in the Negro school in contrast to the assignment of 45 commercial students per teacher in the white school and 36 in the Indian school. In the *Jefferson County* decree, the Fifth Circuit directs its attention to such matters and explicitly orders school officials to take "prompt steps" to correct such inequalities. School authorities, who hold responsibility for administration, are not allowed to sit back complacently and expect unorganized pupils or parents to effect a cure for these shockingly discriminatory conditions. The decree provides:

"Conditions of overcrowding, as determined by pupil-teacher ratios and pupil-classroom ratios shall, to the

munity has been subjected to retaliatory violence, evictions, loss of jobs, and other forms of intimidation."

U.S. COMM'N ON CIVIL RIGHTS, SURVEY OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN THE SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES—1965-66, at 51 (1966). In addition to the above enumeration, a report of the Office of Education has pointed out that Negro children in the high school grades refrain from choosing to transfer because of reluctance to assume additional risks close to graduation. Coleman & Campbell, Equality of Educational Opportunity (U.S. Office of Education, 1966). See also *Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary*, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 23 (1966).

¹⁶ HEW Reg. A, 45 C.F.R. § 181.17(c) (Supp. 1966).

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

extent feasible, be *distributed evenly* between schools formerly maintained for Negro students and those formerly maintained for white students. If for any reason it is not feasible to improve sufficiently any school formerly maintained for Negro students, * * * such school shall be *closed* as soon as possible, and students enrolled in the school shall be reassigned on the basis of freedom of choice." ¹⁷

II. Faculty

Defendants unabashedly argue that they cannot be compelled to take any affirmative action in reassigning teachers, despite the fact that teachers are hired to teach in the *system*, not in a particular school. They assert categorically that "they are not required under the Constitution to desegregate the faculty." This is in the teeth of *Bradley v. School Bd. of Richmond*, 382 U.S. 103 (1965).

Having made this declaration, they say that they have nevertheless submitted a plan which does provide for faculty desegregation, but circumspectly they add that "it will require time and patience." They protest that they have done all that could possibly be demanded of them by providing a plan which would permit "a constructive beginning." This argument lacks appeal an eighth of a century after *Brown*.¹⁸ Children too young for the first grade at

¹⁷ F.2d at (en banc). (Emphasis supplied.)

¹⁸ "The rule has become: the later the start the shorter the time allowed for transition." *Lockett v. Bd. of Educ. of Muscogee County*, 342 F.2d 225, 228 (5th Cir. 1965). See *Rogers v. Paul*, 382 U.S. 198, 199 (1965); *Bradley v. School Bd. of Richmond*, 382 U.S. 103 (1965); *Griffin v. County School Bd.*, 377 U.S. 218, 229 (1964); *Watson v. City of Memphis*, 373 U.S. 526, 530 (1963).

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

the time of that decision are beyond high school age by now. Yet their entire school experience, like that of their elder brothers and sisters, parents and grandparents, has been one of total segregation. They have attended only a "Negro" school with an all Negro staff and an all Negro student body. If their studies encompassed *Brown v. Bd. of Educ.* they must surely have concluded sadly that "the law of the land" is singularly ineffective as to them.

The plans of both counties grandly profess that the pattern of staff assignment "will not be such that only white teachers are sought for predominantly white schools and only Negro teachers are sought for predominantly Negro schools." No specific steps are set out, however, by which the boards mean to integrate faculties. It cannot escape notice that the plans provide only for assignments of "new personnel in a manner that will *work towards* the desegregation of faculties." As for teachers presently employed by the systems, they will be "allowed" (in Charles City County, the plan reads "allowed and encouraged") to accept transfers to schools in which the majority of the faculty members are of the opposite race. We are told that heretofore an average of only 2.6 new white teachers have been employed annually in New Kent County. Thus the plan would lead to desegregation only by slow attrition. There is no excuse for thus protracting the corrective process. School authorities may not abdicate their plain duty in this fashion. The plans filed in these cases leave it to the *teachers*, rather than the Board, to "disestablish dual, racially segregated school systems" and to establish "a unitary, non-racial system." This the law does not permit.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

As the Fifth Circuit has put it, "school authorities have an *affirmative duty* to break up the historical pattern of segregated faculties, the hallmark of the dual system."¹⁹

"[U]ntil school authorities recognize and carry out their affirmative duty to integrate faculties as well as facilities, there is not the slightest possibility of their ever establishing an operative non-discriminatory school system."²⁰

In contrast to the frail and irresolute plans submitted by the appellees, the Fifth Circuit has ordered school officials within its jurisdiction not only to make *initial assignments* on a non-discriminatory basis, but also to *reassign* staff members "to eliminate past discriminatory patterns."

For this reason, I wholeheartedly endorse the majority's demand for the inclusion of an *objective* timetable to facilitate evaluation of the progress of school authorities in desegregating their faculties. I also join the majority in calling upon the District Court to fashion a specific and comprehensive order requiring the boards to take firm steps to achieve *substantial* desegregation of the faculties. At this late date a desegregation plan containing only an indefinite pious statement of future good intentions does not merit judicial approval.

¹⁹ F.2d at

²⁰ United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ., F.2d, (5th Cir. 1966), *adopted en banc*, F.2d (5th Cir. Mar. 29, 1967). This thought has been similarly expressed in Bradley v. School Bd. of City of Richmond, 345 F.2d 310, 323 (4th Cir. 1965) (concurring opinion):

"It is now 1965 and high time for the court to insist that good faith compliance requires administrators of schools to proceed actively with *their* nontransferable duty to undo the segregation which both by action and inaction has been persistently perpetuated." (Emphasis in the original.)

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

I must disagree with the prevailing opinion, however, where it states that the record is insufficiently developed to order the school systems to take further steps at this stage. No legally acceptable justification appears, or is even faintly intimated, for not immediately integrating the faculties. The court underestimates the clarity and force of the facts in the present record, particularly with respect to New Kent County, where there are only two schools, with identical programs of instruction, and each with a staff of 26 teachers. The situation presented in the records before us is so patently wrong that it cries out for immediate remedial action, not an inquest to discover what is obvious and undisputed.

It is time for this circuit to speak plainly to its district courts and tell them to require the school boards to get on with their task—no longer avoidable or deferrable—to integrate their faculties. In *Kier v. County School Bd. of Augusta County*, 249 F. Supp. 239, 247 (W.D. Va. 1966), Judge Michie, in ordering complete desegregation by the following years of the staffs of the schools in question, required that "the percentage of Negro teachers in each school in the system should approximate the percentage of the Negro teachers in the entire system" for the previous year. See *Dowell v. School Bd.*, 244 F. Supp. 971, 977-78 (W.D. Okla. 1965), *aff'd*, 35 U.S.L. WEEK 2484 (10th Cir., Jan. 23, 1967), *cert. denied*, 35 U.S.L. WEEK 3418 (U.S. May 29, 1967). While this may not be the precise formula appropriate for the present cases, it does indicate the attitude that district courts may be expected to take if this court speaks with clarity and firmness.

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

III. *The Briggs v. Elliott Dictum*

The defendants persist in their view that it is constitutionally permissible for *parents* to make a choice and assign their children; that courts have no role to play where segregation is not actively *enforced*. They say that *Brown* only proscribes enforced segregation, and does not command action to undo existing consequences of earlier enforced segregation, repeating the facile formula of *Briggs v. Elliott*.²¹

The court's opinion recognizes that "it is the duty of the school boards to eliminate the discrimination which inheres" in a system of segregated schools where the "initial assignments are both involuntary and dictated by racial criteria," but seems to think the system under consideration today "a very different thing." I fail to perceive any basis for a distinction. Certainly the two counties with which we are here concerned, like the rest of Virginia, historically had *de jure* segregation of public education, so that by the court's own definition, the boards are under a duty "to eliminate the discrimination which inheres" in such a system. Whether or not the schools now permit "freedom of choice," the segregated conditions initially created *by law* are still perpetuated by relying primarily on Negro pupils "to extricate themselves from the segregation which has long been firmly established and resolutely maintained ***."²² "[T]hose who operate the schools formerly segre-

²¹ "Nothing in the Constitution or in the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination." 132 F. Supp. 776, 777 (E.D.S.C. 1955).

²² *Bradley v. School Bd. of City of Richmond*, 345 F.2d 310, 322 (4th Cir. 1965) (concurring opinion).

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

gated by law, and not those who attend, are responsible for school desegregation.”²³

It is worth recalling the circumstances that gave birth to the *Briggs v. Elliott* dictum—it is no more than that dictum. A three-judge district court over which Judge Parker presided had denied relief to South Carolina Negro pupils and when this decision came before the Supreme Court as part of the group of cases reviewed in *Brown v. Bd. of Educ.*, the Court overruled the three-judge court and issued its mandate to admit the complaining pupils to public schools “on a racially non-discriminatory basis with all deliberate speed.” Reassembling the three-judge panel, Judge Parker understood to put his gloss upon the Supreme Court’s decision and coined the famous saying.²⁴ This catchy apothegm immediately became the refuge of defenders of the segregation system, and it has been quoted uncritically to eviscerate the Supreme Court’s mandate.²⁵

²³ Dunn, *Title VI, the Guidelines and School Desegregation in the South*, 53 VA. L. REV. 42, 45 (1967).

See Dowell v. School Bd., 244 F. Supp. 971, 975, 981 (W.D. Okla. 1965), *aff’d*, 35 U.S.L. WEEK 2484 (10th Cir. Jan. 23, 1967), *cert. denied*, 35 U.S.L. WEEK 3418 (U.S. May 29, 1967):

“The Board maintains that it has no affirmative duty to adopt policies that would increase the percentage of pupils who are obtaining a desegregated education. But a school system does not remain static, and the failure to adopt an affirmative policy is itself a policy, adherence to which, at least in this case, has slowed up—in some cases—reversed the desegregation process.

• • •

The duty to disestablish segregation is clear in situations such as Oklahoma City, where such school segregation policies were in force and their effects have not been corrected.” (Emphasis supplied.)

²⁴ See n.21, *supra*.

²⁵ Judge Wisdom, in the course of a penetrating criticism of the *Briggs* decision, says:

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

Having a deep respect for Judge Parker's capacity to discern the lessons of experience and his high fidelity to duty and judicial discipline, it is unnecessary for me to speculate how long he would have adhered to his view, or when he would have abandoned the dictum as unworkable, and inherently contradictory.²⁶ In any event, the dictum cannot withstand the authority of the Supreme Court or survive its exposition of the spirit of the *Brown* holding, as elaborated in *Bradley v. School Bd.*, 382 U.S. 103 (1965); *Goss v. Bd. of Educ.*, 373 U.S. 683 (1963); *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958).

"Briggs overlooks the fact that Negroes collectively are harmed when the state, by law or custom, operates segregated schools or a school system with uncorrected effects of segregation."

Adequate redress therefore calls for much more than allowing a few Negro children to attend formerly white schools; it calls for liquidation of the state's system of de jure school segregation and the organized undoing of the effects of past segregation."

The central vice in a formerly de jure segregated public school system is apartheid by dual zoning ***. Dual zoning persists in the continuing operation of Negro schools identified as Negro, historically and because the faculty and students are Negroes. Acceptance of an individual's application for transfer, therefore, may satisfy that particular individual; it will not satisfy the class. The class is all Negro children in a school district attending, by definition, inherently unequal schools and wearing the badge of slavery separation displays. Relief to the class requires school boards to desegregate the school from which a transferee comes as well as the school to which he goes. *** [T]he overriding right of Negroes as a class [is] to a completely integrated public education."

F.2d at (Emphasis supplied.)

²⁶ Shortly after pronouncing his dictum, in another school case Judge Parker nevertheless recognized that children cannot enroll themselves and that the duty of enrolling them and operating schools in accordance with law rests upon the officials and cannot be shifted to the pupils or their parents. *Carson v. Warlick*, 238 F.2d 724, 728 (1956).

Concurring Opinion of Judges Sobeloff and Winter

Anything that some courts may have said in discussing the obligation of school officials to overcome the effects of *de facto* residential segregation, caused by private acts and not imposed by law, is certainly not applicable here. Ours is the only circuit dealing with school segregation resulting from past legal compulsion that still adheres to the *Briggs* dictum.

"The Fourth is apparently the only circuit of the three that continues to cling to the doctrine of *Briggs v. Elliott* and embraces freedom of choice as a final answer to school desegregation in the absence of intimidation and harrassment."²⁷

We should move out from under the incubus of the *Briggs v. Elliott* dictum and take our stand beside the Fifth and the Eighth Circuits.

²⁷ Dunn, *Title VI, the Guidelines and School Desegregation in the South*, 53 VA. L. REV. 42, 72 (1967). See United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ., F.2d (5th Cir., Mar. 29, 1967) (en banc); Singleton v. Jackson Munic. Separate School Dist., 348 F.2d 729, 730 n.5 (5th Cir. 1965) ("[T]he second Brown opinion clearly imposes on public school authorities the duty to provide an integrated school system. Judge Parker's well known dictum * * * in *Briggs v. Elliott* * * * should be laid to rest. It is inconsistent with Brown and the later development of decisional and statutory law in the area of civil rights."); Kemp v. Beasley, 352 F.2d 14, 21 (8th Cir. 1965) ("The dictum in *Briggs* has not been followed or adopted by this Circuit and it is logically inconsistent with Brown and subsequent decisional law on this subject.")

Cf. Evans v. Ennis, 281 F.2d 385, 389 (3d Cir. 1960), cert. denied, 364 U.S. 933 (1961): "The Supreme Court has unqualifiedly declared integration to be their constitutional right." (Emphasis supplied.)

**Judgment of United States Court of Appeals
For the Fourth Circuit**

No. 10,792

Charles C. Green, Carroll A. Green and Robert C. Green,
infants, by Calvin C. Green and Mary O. Green,
their father and mother and next friends,
and all others of the plaintiffs,
Appellants,

versus

County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia, et al.,
Appellees.

**APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**

This cause came on to be heard on the record from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond, for further proceedings consistent with the opinion of the Court filed herein; and that each side bear its own costs on appeal.

CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR.
Chief Judge, Fourth Circuit

Filed: June 12, 1967
Maurice S. Dean, Clerk

**Order Extending Time to File Petition for
Writ of Certiorari**

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No., OCTOBER TERM, 1967

SHIRLETTE L. BOWMAN, CHARLES C. GREEN, et al.,

Petitioners,

—vs.—

**COUNTY SCHOOL BOARDS OF CHARLES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA,
and NEW KENT COUNTY, VIRGINIA, et al.**

UPON CONSIDERATION of the application of counsel for
petitioner(s),

IT IS ORDERED that the time for filing a petition for writ
of certiorari in the above-entitled cause be, and the same
is hereby, extended to and including October 10, 1967.

/s/ HUGO L. BLACK
*Associate Justice of the Supreme
Court of the United States*

Dated this 8th day of September, 1967

Order Allowing Certiorari—December 11, 1967

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 695, OCTOBER TERM, 1967

CHARLES C. GREEN, et al.,

Petitioners,

—vs.—

**COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF NEW KENT COUNTY,
VIRGINIA; et al.,**

Respondents.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted and the case is placed on the Summary Calendar.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.